

Appln No. 10/751,031
Amdt date August 31, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 1, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments:

Claim 1 has been amended to include defendant claim 6, and thus claim 6 was canceled. Claims 7, 8-13, 15, and 17-18 have been placed into independent form as new claims 23-32, for the purpose of placing them into a condition for immediate allowance. No new matter has been added.

Section 102 Rejections:

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Itikawa et al. (US 6,312,400). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons. Claim 6, which was originally filed with the application and defendant on claim 1, requires a motor with at least one eccentrically mounted bearing. The Itkawa et al. reference makes no disclosure of an eccentrically mounted bearing, or any eccentric motion of any of its moving parts. By way of example, the "wobbling" motion of the present invention, is described on page 7 line 23 through page 8, line 20. In an embodiment, the plates attached to the motor move both longitudinally (upward and downward) and slightly laterally (side to side) with respect to the longitudinal axis of the output shaft of the motor.

Because claim 1 has been amended to incorporate independent claim 6, claim 1 is not anticipated by Itkawa et al. because claim 1 now requires at least one eccentrically mounted bearing. Consequently, claims 2-3, 8, 14, and 16, which are defendant on claim 1, are not anticipated by Itkawa et al. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 8, 14 and 16.

Section 103 Rejections:

Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Itikawa et al. in view of Itikawa et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at

Appln No. 10/751,031
Amdt date August 31, 2006
Reply to Office action of May 1, 2006

least the following reasons. In view of the amendment of claim 1 to include the requirements of claim 6, claims 4 and 5 now include the requirement of an eccentrically mounted bearing. Thus, Itikawa does not substantially disclose the present invention as claimed. Thus, it would not have been obvious to use Itikawa to modify Itikawa. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Conclusions

In view of the arguments above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 6, 8 14, 16, and 23-32.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By



Robert P. Auerbach
Reg. No. 46,525
626/795-9900

RPA/lal

LAL PAS693914.1-* 08/31/06 8:50 AM